

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/539,107	HEYDUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NARAYAN K. BHAT	1634	

All Participants:

(1) Examine: Bhat.

(2) Representative: Ms. Rebecca C. Riley Vargas.

Date of Interview: 23 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Claims 109, 127, 143 and 155

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Narayan K. Bhat/
Examiner, Art Unit 1634

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative Ms. Rebecca C. Riley Vargas on July 23, 2010 to discuss the amended claims filed on June 18, 2010 to place them in a better condition for allowance. The Examiner suggested amending claim 143 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 144 excluding an analyte and amending claim 155 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 156 excluding an analyte would place the remaining claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner further suggested cancelling withdrawn claims 112-115, 117, 128-129 and 130 because their scopes are different from claims 109, 127, 143 and 155. The examiner also suggested cancelling independent claim 131 and dependent claims 132-133 and 135-142 because the limitations of claim 131 are anticipated by Baez et al. Applicant's representative informed the Examiner that she would fax the proposed amendments to claims 143 and 155 directly to the Examiner.

The Examiner contacted the representative on August 23, 2010 to suggest amending claims 110, 122-123, 127, 143, 150-151, 155, 160, 162 and 163, changing the dependency of claim 160 from claim 155 to claim 159 to provide proper antecedent basis, and cancelling claim 158 because the scope of claim 154 would be identical to claim 146. The representative authorized changes on August 23, 2010 including cancellation of claims 112-115, 117, 128-133, 135-142, 144, 156 and 158.